

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 268

JC 820 488

AUTHOR Jenkins, Hobart G.
TITLE Development of Policy Options to Maximize Access to Community Colleges by CETA-Eligible Individuals.
INSTITUTION Washington State Board for Community Coll. Education, Olympia.; Washington State Dept. of Employment Security, Olympia.
PUB DATE [82]
GRANT 41-10-1861
NOTE 43p.; Prepared with funds made available under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), Special Grants to Governors, Employment Security Department, Employment and Training Division.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Declining Enrollment; *Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Opportunities; *Employment Programs; *Enrollment Influences; *Enrollment Projections; Enrollment Trends; State Surveys; *Student Financial Aid; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; *Washington

ABSTRACT

In 1981, a study was conducted to predict the possible effects of increased tuition and enrollment limitations in Washington on the community college enrollment of persons eligible for Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) programs. Within four sample geographic areas, historical and projected data were collected from all CETA prime sponsors and matching community colleges. CETA sources were asked to provide data on the enrollment of CETA students in fall 1978, 1979, and 1980 in seven vocational program areas and to project community college enrollments for fall 1981 by program category. College sources were asked to provide information on the number of financial aid awards made to CETA-eligible students, who were not CETA supported, during fall 1979 through fall 1980; on enrollments in the seven program areas; and on projected enrollments and financial aid awards for fall 1981. The study report details methodology and presents findings with respect to CETA-referred enrollments; differences between trend line projections and vocational directors' estimates for vocational enrollments; CETA enrollment peculiarities; CETA-college relations; CETA training formats; combined training options; adult basic education and English as a second language problems; advisory groups; disadvantaged clientele; shared funding potentials; and referral estimates. In addition, study conclusions and policy and administrative options are discussed. Data tables and relevant documentation are appended. (KL)

ED223268

DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY OPTIONS
TO MAXIMIZE ACCESS TO COMMUNITY COLLEGES
BY CETA-ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS

GRANT AWARD 41-10-1861

A study conducted by the State Board for Community College
Education, State of Washington in cooperation with the Employment
and Training Division, Department of Employment Security

Project Director	Hobart G. Jenkins, Ed.D.
Associate Director	Edward P. Smith, Ed.D.
Project Coordination	Richard G. Moe, SBCCE Margaret Genster, Employment Security

*Prepared with funds made available under the Comprehensive Employment
and Training Act (CETA), Special Grants to Governors, Employment
Security Department, Employment and Training Division. John Spellman,
Governor; Norwood J. Brooks, Commissioner. Completed 30 September 1981.*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard G. Moe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ACTION PLAN.	3
III. THE STUDY.	7
IV. DEFINITIONS.	9
V. ANALYSIS OF DATA	.10
VI. SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS	.12
VII. CONCLUSIONS.	.18
VIII. IMPLEMENTATION	.23

APPENDIX A

Table 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17

APPENDIX B

Minutes of the Steering Committee

APPENDIX C

Map of Study

APPENDIX D

State Board for Community College Resolution '81-68

DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY OPTIONS
TO MAXIMIZE ACCESS TO COMMUNITY COLLEGES
BY CETA-ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS

STATEMENT OF NEED

During the 1980-81 school year, the community college system in Washington enrolled an estimated 99,000 full-time equivalent students. Of the total, 8.3 percent is represented by minority students, which is over two-thirds of the public higher education undergraduate minority enrollment in the state. Approximately half of these FTEs were enrolled in vocational programs and courses, which makes the community college system far and away the largest deliverer of vocational services to citizens of the state of Washington.

Because of the nature of the community colleges and their ability to respond to community needs, a great many special interest groups are served in one training capacity or another. In the instant case, over one half of the classroom training provided to Washington State CETA participants comes through the state's community college system.

Following the actions of the 1981 legislative session, the community colleges find themselves in a very constrained position regarding enrollments. The legislature has clearly indicated that the practice of over-enrolling of students as occurred in the past will not be countenanced in the future. The legislature has provided an enrollment contract level for the 1981-83 biennium of 92,000 annual average full-time equivalents. If one assumes a six percent enrollment overrun, this theoretically could elevate that number to 97,520. Assuming the higher number compared with the actual enrollments for 1980-81, we see that the level of enrollments is, in fact, reduced. An additional factor of significance to this discussion is the tuition increase of 70 percent that was also enacted by the 1981 legislature.

At the federal level, there appears to be a move to reduce the resources available for CETA as well. Given these primary constraints to the enrollment of CETA-eligible recipients, it seems reasonable that the resources available to community college vocational education and CETA resources should be carefully coordinated to make the most efficient and comprehensive use of these resources to meet the needs of eligible individuals. In the recent past, planning for the use of these resources, both by the community college system and CETA, has proceeded along separate routes. Roadblocks to effective cooperative planning are many, including differences in planning cycles, differences in service areas, differences in funding targets, and the composition of authority of planning bodies. This has not been a major problem since both systems in the past have received extensive public support and funding, which allowed these two systems to proceed along their own paths.

Although frequent discussion occurred between the agencies regarding the ideal of coordination and cooperation, the implementation of these activities was not given high priority in either organization. Since both systems now face severely diminished resources and an unabated demand for their services, several policy questions need to be addressed by the State Board and local community college districts, as well as the CETA Prime Sponsors. The community college system is anticipating that the limitation of enrollment in the state's public universities and colleges will reflect itself in increased demand upon the community colleges for academic programs for those students denied entrance to the four-year institutions.

The implication for local boards of trustees, given all of the foregoing circumstances, are enormous and since the majority of classroom training for CETA participants was conducted through the state's vocational technical institutes and community colleges, it is imperative that the potential effects of funding and enrollment limitations on CETA-eligible client population be identified clearly and that the agencies governing these schools and dealing with them take appropriate policy action to continue needed services to the disadvantaged population.

ACTION PLAN

Purpose. The purpose of this project is to predict possible impacts on CETA-eligible persons and to recommend policy to ameliorate those impacts.

It is anticipated CETA-eligible persons may suffer reduced opportunities to enroll in community college vocational programs due to increased tuition charges and enrollment limitations imposed by legislative constraints. The project will endeavor to predict the extent and nature of the reduction in opportunities faced by CETA-eligible persons. Following these steps, the project is expected to produce a set of policy recommendations that would be useful to the CETA administrators and to the statewide community college system to lessen adverse effects predicted by the project.

Methodology. Representative CETA planning districts will be selected and matched with community college districts. This will insure that counts of populations of CETA-eligible persons will match the college enrollments by program. Error introduced by emigrating and immigrating CETA-eligible persons is expected to be minimal, if not a wash.

Data will be collected for FY 1979-80-81 from CETA sources indicating the numbers of people enrolled for training in the matching community college(s) by program. Data will be collected from community colleges for the same time period indicating the number of financial aid grantees who could be considered CETA eligible. These data will be treated as base line enrollment populations. All data will be related to fall quarter enrollments as reported in the MIS-2 from SBCCE.

The FY 1982 plans for CETA-supported trainees will be collected from all CETA prime sponsors. Financial aid recipient data for fall quarter 1981 will be collected from the colleges. These data will constitute the CETA-eligible enrollment base for FY 1982. Data will be collected from colleges indicating the enrollment levels by program that are expected to be produced in the fall quarter. Graphic representation of the historical data should provide a linear regression projection which will be based on the 1978-79-81 fall quarter data. This projection can be compared to base level fall quarter 1981 enrollment expectations. Significant differences should be a result of the effect of increased tuition and reduced enrollment levels.

To determine the effect statewide, it will be necessary to collect CETA training plan data from all prime sponsors, college program enrollment plans, and financial aid grants to CETA-eligible persons from all colleges. The college data will be estimates.

The FY 1982 (fall quarter 1981) projected enrollment levels will be compared against the projection from the data base regression line for all CETA prime sponsor districts.

These data and comparisons will be the basis for predicting FY 1982 effects on the CETA-eligible population. Policy recommendations are expected to evolve from those predictions.

Specific Approach. Historical trends will be established by Sampling Technique. Four areas will be used: (1) Seattle-King County consortium; (2) Spokane-Spokane, Ferry, Pend Oreille, Lincoln, and Whitman counties; (3) Chelan, Douglas, and Okanogan counties; and (4) Walla Walla, Columbia counties. The sample will deal with data from the community colleges within these four areas.

CETA enrollments will be collected in each area by college according to the following program profile:

1. Agriculture and agricultural-related programs,
2. Distributive education,
3. Health programs,
4. Home and family life (gainful),
5. Business and office occupations,
6. Technical occupations,
7. Trade and industrial occupations.

The data elements to be collected are:

1. CETA sources:

- a. Enrollments of CETA students from the four sample areas who enrolled in the specified community colleges during the months of August, September, October, and November of 1978, 1979, 1980. These data will be collected by program categories listed previously in this report.
- b. The number of planned enrollments to be made in community colleges for August, September, October, November of 1981 for all prime sponsors in the state, by program category.

2. College sources:

- a. The number of financial aid awards made to students who are CETA eligible, but not CETA supported, for the fall quarter of 1978, 1979, 1980. These will be collected only from colleges in the sample areas.
- b. Enrollments in the seven program categories for fall quarter 1978, 79, 80. These data will be collected only from the sample group.
- c. Projected enrollments by college by program categories on a statewide basis.
- d. Financial aid awards made for fall quarter 1981 to students classified as CETA eligible from all colleges.

There will be regression lines prepared by program category for each of the four sample areas and by college within those areas. The 81 enrollment projections will be an extrapolation of this regression line.

This 1981 enrollment projection will be compared with the planned enrollment levels of the colleges. Differences between college planning and the regression line prediction will be attributed to tuition and support level changes.

A similar regression line projection will be made for CETA enrollments in 1978, 1979, and 1980, which will predict a 1981 service level position. This position will be compared to the actual CETA 1981 planned service level. The difference will be attributed to changes within CETA funding programs.

Changes in enrollment levels attributed to financial causes in both CETA and colleges will be the affected populations for which the project has primary concerns.

Analysis and inference techniques will be used to interpret these data, differences in expectations, and deviations from predictions.

Sample Areas and Sample Colleges in those Areas:

1. Seattle-King County

Seattle North Community College
Seattle Central Community College
Seattle South Community College
Highline Community College

Green River Community College
Bellevue Community College
Shoreline Community College

2. Spokane City-Spokane, Ferry, Stevens, Pend Oreille, Lincoln, and Whitman counties

Spokane Community College
Spokane Falls Community College

3. Chelan, Okanogan, and Douglas counties

Wenatchee Valley College

4. Columbia and Walla Walla counties

Walla Walla Community College

Reports. A data report will be prepared which will include all CETA prime sponsor areas and all the 27 community colleges. Tables and graphs will be included so that policy inferences can be reviewed at later dates.

The steering committee will be activated, review the data report, and prepare a draft of policy recommendations.

Following review of the draft policy recommendations by college and CETA administrators, the steering committee will prepare a second draft of policy recommendations for presentation to the executive director of SBCCE and the appropriate CETA officials. A third draft will be produced which will be presented to the appropriate policy bodies for consideration.

Calendar

July 6-9	Prepare action plan
July 10	Delivery of action plan to CETA, SBCCE for approval
July 13-24	Data collection
July 24 - Aug. 4	Data analysis and synthesis
Aug. 4-6	First draft of policy statements
Aug. 7	Steering committee meeting in Olympia
Aug. 10-12	Second draft of policy statements
Aug. 14	Presentation to WACCP
Aug. 17	Presentation to vocational directors
Aug. 19-26	Preparation of third draft
Sept. 3	Third draft review by SBCCE staff
Sept. 18	Delivery of project report and fourth draft of policy statements to SBCCE and CETA
Sept. 30	Project completion

THE STUDY

The research team collected enrollment by program area from SBCCE source documents for the school years of 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81. The program areas were the seven OE occupational areas of Agriculture, Distributive Education, Health Occupations, Home and Family Life Useful, Business and Office Occupations, Technical Education, and Trade and Industrial programs. CETA enrollments for the same time period were collected from prime sponsors or the sponsor's referral agency.

A sample area was established consisting of four sub-areas. These were (a) Seattle and King county, (b) Spokane and adjacent counties, (c) Walla Walla and Columbia county, and (d) Chelan, Okanogan, and Douglas counties. The community colleges included in the sample sub-areas were as follows:

Area A - Seattle King County

Green River CC
Highline CC
Bellevue CC

Seattle Central CC
North Seattle CC
South Seattle CC
Shoreline CC

Area B - Spokane District

Spokane CC
Spokane Falls CC

Area C - Walla Walla-Columbia Counties

Walla Walla CC

Area D - Chelan, Okanogan and Douglas Counties

Wenatchee Valley College

A 1981 enrollment projection was produced by a regression line calculation by program area. Using regression line equations in trend line analysis, projections of expected results were made assuming the historical conditions remained constant through the period 1978-81.

Historical comparisons were made to determine:

- A. What percentage of the enrollment in each program area was CETA-referred students;
- B. What percentage of the CETA-referred students were enrolled in each program area;
- C. What percentage of CETA students were enrolled in the fall quarter;
- D. What differences exist between trend line projections and the vocational directors' estimates of Fall 1981 vocational preparatory programs;

E. What changes in CETA referrals are projected for school year 1981-82; and

F. Anticipated impacts on CETA referrals in school year 1981-82.

It was assumed the sample areas and colleges examined would be representative of the state as a whole and the 27 colleges as a whole. Therefore, trend line data from the sample was applied to the state as a whole.

A second element of the study was to interview prime sponsors, referral agency and college people who are responsible for implementing the CETA programs. These people were asked to verbalize their perceptions of the program, the relationships between CETA and the colleges, and the CETA clients themselves.

The third part of the study was the compilation of significant findings. These findings were developed by inference, direct observation, or compiled from observations of others. Careful consideration of the implications of these findings was expected to lead to the development of policy options for consideration by the State Board for Community College Education and district boards of trustees.

DEFINITIONS

The following terms were used in this study and the meaning attached thereto.

1. CETA-Eligible. Persons who had incomes and work experience that met federal guidelines for CETA training programs. As a rule of thumb, it meant an unemployed person who had (a) dependent status with a family income of less than \$12,000, or (b) married with one or more dependents and an income of less than \$12,000; or (c) independent status with an income of less than \$5,000.
2. 1981 Vocational Director. This term is the fall quarter 1981 estimate of preparatory vocational headcount provided by the college vocational director.
3. 1981 Project. This term is the fall quarter 1981 estimate of preparatory vocational headcount provided by using a trend line analysis technique. This technique was implemented in this study by using the fall quarter 1978, 1979, 1980 headcount from the SBCCE data bank and calculating a regression line equation for fall quarter 1981. The equation used was:

$$y = \left(\frac{\sum xy}{\sum x^2} \right) x \text{ where } x = X - \bar{X} \text{ and } y = Y - \bar{Y}$$

4. Private Vocational School. This term is used to describe any vocational training institution, profit or non-profit. It also includes the VTIs associated with several western Washington school districts.
5. 1981 CETA Plan. The numbers used in that context were obtained from each of the prime sponsors and represent the best estimate of the level of training in CETA Title IIB in FY 1982.
6. ABE. Adult Basic Education.
7. General Education Development (GED). This term is also used to indicate a certificate issued in lieu of a high school diploma and is considered equivalent to a high school diploma by many employers.
8. ESL. English as a Second Language.
9. Diploma Program. This term designated vocational training programs which provide entry-level job skills but are of a shorter duration than an associate degree program. These programs are similar to degree programs, but lack general education classes.
10. Certificate Program. Similar to diploma program except generally two quarters or less in length. Typical certificate programs are between 20 and 30 credits in scope.
11. Combined Training. These programs combine group instruction in core knowledge training and individual skill training on the job.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data revealed many interesting statistics.

1. The sample area of Seattle/King County, Spokane/adjacent counties, Walla Walla/Columbia counties, and Chelan, Okanogan and Douglas counties comprised 62 percent of the total state vocational preparatory headcount.
2. There were 11 community colleges included in the sample area.
3. CETA enrollments expressed as a percentage of the sample vocational preparatory enrollments were:

Ag	Dist Ed	Health Occup	Home & Family	Business & Off.	Technical	T&I	Total
1.4	1.6	2.5	0.5	7.9	4.0	4.1	4.3

4. The fall quarter enrollment of CETA students accounted for 56 percent of all CETA enrollments. The remainder was split among spring, winter and summer quarters.
5. The CETA enrollments by program expressed as a percentage of total CETA enrollment was:

Ag	Dist Ed	Health Occup	Home & Family	Business & Off.	Technical	T&I
2	4	6	1	51	9	27

6. The vocational directors estimated that the fall quarter 1981 preparatory enrollments would be higher than fall quarter 1980 by 1,369 students.
7. The trend line enrollment forecast was 1,150 students higher than the vocational directors' enrollment estimate. This was 5.8 percent higher than vocational directors indicated they expected the enrollment level to be.
8. The trend line analysis projection predicted more students than the vocational directors estimated in the following program areas for fall quarter 1981:

Dist Ed	Home & Family	Business/ Office	Technical	T&I	Total
234	105	81	337	791	1,548

9. The trend line analysis projection predicted fewer students than the vocational directors estimated in the following program areas for fall quarter 1981:

Agriculture	Health	Total
195	203	398

10. During the three years (1978-79-80), CETA enrollments were very stable with 842 enrolled in 1978, 862 in 1979, and 844 in 1980, in the sample areas.
11. It was projected that the community college system accommodated 1,352 CETA students in 1980-81 in the following programs.

Ag	Dist Ed	Health Occup	Home & Family	Business & Off.	Technical	T&I
22	59	108	10	644	155	354

12. CETA support for individual referrals for 1982 was projected at 3,993. Community colleges could expect 2,117 of these students on their campuses. Of that number 1,185 can be expected to enroll in the fall quarter. These students are expected to be distributed as follows:

	Ag	Dist Ed	Health Occup	Home & Family	Business & Off.	Technical	T&I
Fall	24	48	71	11	604	107	320
All Year	42	85	127	20	1,080	191	572

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

1. Looking at Vocational Enrollments. Vocational directors are projecting their colleges will be serving more students in vocational preparatory programs in FY 1981 than were served in FY 1980. Statewide, the directors expected to serve 32,415 students in 1981, while they served 30,722 students in 1980. This is an increase of 1,693 students. There were 14 colleges reporting an expected increase, 12 reporting an expected decrease, and one college reported no change in enrollment. Table 10 details these data. Some colleges indicated they expected to reduce continuing education, summer session, or vocational supplemental programs to provide for growth in vocational preparatory programs. - A majority of vocational directors indicated that preparatory programs had a higher priority than other programs on campus and would be allowed to grow. The increase in vocational preparatory enrollment as predicted by vocational directors is 5.5 percent.

TABLE 10
GROWTH COLLEGES

College	1980	1981	Growth
Bellevue	1,673	1,848	175
Big Bend	402	482	80
Centralia	295	321	26
Clark	940	995	55
Everett	1,390	1,394	4
Grays Harbor	433	631	198
Highline	1,976	2,130	154
Lower Columbia	738	765	27
Olympia Technical	1,016	1,030	14
Olympic	1,131	1,942	811
Seattle Central	2,113	3,005	892
Seattle North	1,405	1,415	10
Skagit Valley	701	769	68
Spokane	3,465	3,909	444
			<u>2,958</u>

DECREASING GROWTH COLLEGES

Edmonds	825	740	85
Fort Steilacoom	995	970	25
Green River	1,494	905	589
Peninsula	423	416	7
Seattle South	2,151	2,030	121
Shoreline	1,600	1,487	113
Spokane Falls	2,121	2,102	19
Tacoma	476	427	49
*Walla Walla	787	675	112
Wenatchee Valley	509	435	74
Whatcom	147	117	30
Yakima Valley	729	688	41
			<u>1,265</u>

*261 FTE reduction in contract prison programs.

2. General Facts about CETA. CETA enrollment in the community colleges has been stable for the last three years. On the average, CETA referred students make up 4.3 percent of the total vocational preparatory enrollment. (See item #3 in Analysis of Data Section.) The CETA trainees are concentrated in Business and Office occupational programs and the Trade and Industrial programs. (See item #5 in Data Analysis Section.) The pool of CETA eligible people does not seem to be dwindling. CETA officials expect their 1981-82 school year individual referrals will be 3,993, which is a reduction from the 1980-81 school year. It appears that CETA will be changing the program mix of contract classes and individual referrals. Using trend line analysis techniques, it would be reasonable to assume that CETA would have made 1,352 fall quarter referrals, whereas the fall quarter 1981-82 plans call for only 1,185 referrals. CETA made 1,302 fall quarter referrals in the 1980-81 school year. It can be expected that CETA officials will want to maximize the number of people they can serve. They plan to do this by electing shorter training programs and the least costly contracted classes.
3. CETA Enrollment Peculiarities. CETA refers slightly over half (53 percent) of its individual referral clients to community colleges. The remainder are placed with other vocational schools. Over half (56 percent) of the CETA referrals in community colleges have their initial enrollment in the fall quarter. The remaining initial enrollment is divided among the winter, spring, or summer quarters. CETA personnel report it is often difficult to find training programs in community colleges where the sequence of courses does not mandate the commencement of a program in September. Review of sponsor records indicate that eligible people present themselves to referral agencies in about equal numbers each month. Therefore, CETA referral agencies made significantly more placements in other vocational schools in the winter, spring, and summer quarters than in the community colleges. Among the most frequently cited causes were: (a) there is usually a single-entry point in a program and that is in the fall quarter; (b) the sequence of courses within a program is arranged so that each course in a discipline has become a prerequisite for the following course; (c) the emphasis in vocational programs seems to be more oriented toward associate degree programs; (d) few community college programs are self-paced and proficiency-based; and (e) fewer vocational programs were organized as open entry/open exit in the colleges than in the private schools.

Another problem that arises is the number of vocational preparatory programs in community colleges that will be filled by early summer. These programs then develop waiting lists. Generally, CETA referrals are not made until late in the registration cycle. As a result, CETA students are excluded from the programs which have waiting lists. Most of the programs with waiting lists were in the health occupations and trade and industrial areas. The trade and industrial programs were the second most popular CETA trainee choices.

CETA trainees and CETA managers are often interested in shorter training programs. For example, a person might wish to become a tune up specialist rather than a general auto mechanic. There are many other examples of limited specialties within overall vocational programs where short certificate programs could be developed.

CETA referral agencies need openings in entry-level training programs each quarter. Private vocational schools and VTIs provide more of these kinds of opportunities as a regular matter of business. Community colleges provide these opportunities in some programs on some campuses.

4. CETA/College Relations: Perceptions Pro and Con. There appears to be significant differences in the manner in which the community colleges were perceived by CETA referral agency people. CETA referral administrators were experiencing widely different responses from colleges ranging from complete cooperation to polite indifference. Follow up conversations by project staff revealed that in the colleges where relationships with CETA agencies was described by CETA administrators as excellent, the philosophy of the top college management placed high priorities on serving disadvantaged people. In colleges where CETA relationships were described as something other than excellent, similar interviews revealed that the philosophy of top management did not place high priorities on serving disadvantaged people. These colleges tended to treat disadvantaged people the same as any other person. Colleges that expressed the philosophy of high priorities to the disadvantaged tended to give more attention to the unique needs of these people. College staff attitude toward CETA and the CETA referrals seems directly related to the institution's statement of goals, objectives, and the priority placed on serving the unique needs of special clientele groups. Conversations with college personnel who worked with CETA administrators provided evaluations of the relationship between the college and CETA that were strikingly similar to the evaluation given by CETA administrators.

There were marked differences of perceptions between college personnel and CETA administrators regarding the use of administrative services fees paid by CETA. In those colleges where relationships with CETA were described as something other than excellent, the colleges tended to expect CETA to fund coordinators and counseling services. On the other hand, CETA administrators were critical of these same colleges for not providing more services when the college had been paid an administrative services fee. It was notable that such differences in perceptions related to funding were not expressed by either CETA or college personnel when the relationship between the two had been described as excellent.

5. CETA Training Formats. CETA training is composed of three major components. The Individual Referral is a student who receives a monthly allowance while in training and has tuition and fees paid by CETA. The CETA Contract Class is composed of CETA trainees who are the exclusive membership of the group. CETA pays for all direct expenses plus an administrative services fee. The third type of training environment is combined classroom training and OJT. These CETA students attend classes part of the week and report to their OJT job for the majority of the work week. Employers are given tax incentives and also are reimbursed in part for the wages paid.

Community colleges get slightly more than half of the Individual Referrals. Colleges also bid on Contract Classes and, when successful, teach these

classes on campus. Other vocational schools are more successful than community colleges in winning these contracts. CETA sources indicate that other vocational schools underbid community colleges because of two primary reasons. The first is that the college program tends to be extended over a longer period of time and includes general education subject matter. The second reason is that the overhead costs appear to be lower in other schools than community colleges. The result of these circumstances is that the shorter time period over which allowances are paid to CETA trainees results in a significantly lower total cost to CETA, even though direct instructional costs at community colleges have tended to be lower than private schools.

6. Combined Training. CETA finds classroom and OJT combined training to be an extremely effective way to get untrained, unemployed people into the job market quickly. Many CETA-eligible people are semi-skilled in an occupation and need "hands on" experience. This type of organized training is almost nonexistent in the community colleges. The college funding formula does little to encourage the operation of such non-traditional programs. The funding formula is perceived by many to favor the lecture type class and treats the laboratory vocational class half as well as the lecture class, even though the laboratory is where the high equipment and materials costs are incurred.

Combined training programs have the advantages of (a) not occupying college facilities; (b) providing employment in occupations for which the colleges does not offer lab training, but is able to provide (or can get) the expertise to teach the occupational knowledge portion of the training program; (c) utilizing business and industrial leaders in developing occupational training; and (e) organizing co-op education in a similar fashion as the apprenticeship training program but for shorter time periods; (f) involves the community directly with the college and the social issue of disadvantaged people.

Private vocational schools and vocational technical institutes have tended to be more willing to establish combined training programs. Since combined training reduces the overall cost to CETA for training an individual, CETA could emphasize combined training as CETA funding gets tighter.

7. ABE/GED and ESL Problems. There is a significant increase in Asian refugees in the CETA training program. These people are primarily deficient in the basic skills and in language proficiency. The ABE/GED and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs are especially essential to the development of a refugee's job placement. Any reduced effort in the ESL would adversely impact CETA's efforts to move these people into the labor market. The ABE/GED program is likewise valuable to other CETA-eligible people. The chronically unemployed are usually not well educated. Frequently, a high school diploma is necessary to get a job interview. Reductions in the ABE/GED efforts in the community colleges would be expected to have severe adverse effects on the CETA-eligible population. CETA administrators have great fears that the ABE, GED and ESL programs provided by the community colleges as a part of their commitment toward meeting community needs will be curtailed. Many CETA referrals are enrolled in daytime training programs and also take ABE or GED

classes at night under their already paid tuition. No additional CETA allowance is required, making the education in ABE, GED or ESL classes free to CETA. (These classes are FTE generating and thus are state supported.) The loss of this access would have a severe impact on CETA training plans and would adversely affect the CETA trainee. College plans regarding ABE classes have not been developed.

8. The Untouched CETA-Eligible Person. CETA officials estimate that the CETA program funds the training of about 1/4 to 1/3 of the eligible population. The remainder of this population is on welfare or in training in school under one or more financial programs (or both), or else not served by any agency and living at poverty level. Recruitment of these people to enter training programs is handled largely by the Employment Security Department, local or civil social service activities. Community colleges tend not to actively recruit these students to the campus, but do try to serve them when they arrive on campus. Financial aid funding is generally committed by early summer and the late applicants from this unfunded CETA-eligible population cannot be appropriately accommodated at that time. The segment of the disadvantaged population that is not served by CETA funding generally arrives too late on campus to obtain financial aid. The remainder of this CETA-eligible population remains on welfare, is chronically unemployed, and lives at the poverty level.
9. Campus/CETA Coordination. Communications between CETA prime sponsors and the community colleges has improved in recent years. It appears that some prime sponsor referral agencies have taken the leadership for developing a better communications system. Colleges have tended to look to the CETA people to initiate the process. Some colleges have fragmented CETA coordination activities among several offices on campus. Others concentrate all CETA coordination under a single individual. In the cases where CETA/college relations had been described as excellent, CETA coordination was concentrated under the auspices of a single person.

There was a lack of common forms, procedures and processes used by CETA prime sponsors. Colleges that must deal with more than one prime sponsor or more than one referral agency have experienced unnecessary complications in responding to different reporting requirements for the same program. Data collection from CETA is fragmented and makes research on CETA programs excessively difficult. Uniform reporting, data collection, and common forms emanating from CETA would improve the relationship between colleges and prime sponsors.

10. CETA RFPs for Special Classes. CETA contracts for numerous classes. Requests for Proposals (RFP) are sent to public and private schools. These contract classes provide services for a group of people needing similar training. However, CETA must wait until a group is assembled, an RFP is issued, reviewed, and a contract awarded. In the meantime, people wait while classes are in operation on college campuses that often have room for additional learners. There would be advantages to CETA and the colleges who offer contract classes to develop guidelines which would permit individual CETA enrollees to be enrolled in classes as a single contract student.

11. Advisory Groups. The lay citizen involvement in both the community colleges and CETA is accomplished with vocational advisory committees. Both employers and employee groups are represented. Both groups of lay committees face similar problems. Both groups are concerned with the quality of job entry skill training. However, these groups seldom get together to address common problems and goals. Interviews with administrators from both colleges and CETA referral agencies have identified wide areas of overlap in considering policy that comes before their respective advisory groups. The question is, "Could some of the topics of irritation on both sides be reduced by some regular contact?"
12. Disadvantaged Clientele. The enrollment ceiling and the effect of partially closing the "open door" at community colleges, reduces incentives for colleges to develop innovative ways to serve disadvantaged people. College FTE ceilings can easily be reached without engaging in extensive marketing activities. Since disadvantaged (CETA-eligible) clientele do not normally initiate educational opportunity contacts, this group of people is the most likely clientele to be bypassed and unserved. The role of the community college system includes making these people a target group. The legislature, on occasions, has identified target groups. Displaced homemakers were identified recently and the legislature could identify new target groups. One way to avoid legislative dabbling in educational affairs is for the college system to be alert to the emergence of target groups and to adopt strategies to address the needs of an emerging target group. The CETA-eligible population is low income, educationally disadvantaged, chronically unemployed, and lacking in saleable job skills. These characteristics are typical of a population that is likely to be identified as a target group. Generally, federal involvement with a target group involves establishing a service delivery system outside educational channels. If the college system were in the forefront of advocating remedies for the disadvantaged, the likelihood of legislative intervention, with its concomitant special interest groups, could be reduced.
13. Shared Funding Potential. Campus CETA coordinators and CETA referral agency administrators were generally unaware of the new SBCCE rules on "partially state funded" coded courses. Under the heading of partially state funded courses are two areas called "supplemental" and "shared." These new classifications provide colleges with opportunities to organize classes with CETA that did not exist in the period from 1978-81. Some special efforts to develop appropriate appreciation on the part of presidents, deans, and vocational directors may be needed before the full beneficial potential of these new funding codes could impact CETA-eligible students and CETA programs.
14. CETA officials estimate 3,995 individual referrals will be available in FY 82. The community college share is expected to be 2,117 CETA students in school year 1981-82, of which 1,185 are expected to enroll in the fall quarter.

Projecting college capability to serve CETA students as a constant percentage of previous experience, and based on vocational directors' estimates of their planned 1981-82 vocational preparatory enrollment capability, it is estimated that the colleges could serve 1,352 students in FY 1981, whereas it appears CETA will ask the colleges to serve only 1,185. This is 167 fewer students than would be expected.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The vocational directors of the community college system predict the system will be able to accommodate the number of individual referrals made by CETA, except in programs where facility limitations mandate the use of waiting lists.
2. Nationwide CETA Title II funding (Training for the Disadvantaged) will be reduced by 31.9 percent (\$671,225,000) in FY 1982. CETA referrals will be lower in FY 1981 than they were in FY 1980. CETA Title VII (Private Sector Initiative Program) will be increased by 83 percent (\$124,700,000) in FY 1982.

High school dropouts suffered more from last year's economic downturn than other young people, according to Labor Department statistics. Dropouts' unemployment rate nationwide jumped from 19 percent at the end of 1979 to 25.3 percent at the end of 1980 and dropouts are more often unemployed as the economy slows. Black dropouts were even more strongly affected than others, with an unemployment rate that skyrocketed from 31.7 percent to 44.1 percent. The report is based on Census Bureau data.

Unemployment among all 16 to 24 year olds grew from 11.5 percent to 13.9 percent. Altogether, unemployed out-of-school youths numbered 2.4 million in October 1980, accounting for almost one third of all jobless persons in the nation.

3. ABE/GED and ESL classes are described as "critical" by CETA administrators. They fear reductions in these class offerings will have an adverse impact on the CETA-eligible population. Colleges have not yet completed plans for the 1981-82 scheduling of the ABE/GED program. The ESL classes have been supported by federal funds through SPI. It appears that DSHS may not continue to contract the ESL for refugees through SPI. Community colleges have been the largest provider of services with this money. The assimilation of refugees into the mainstream of society will require continued high level operation of ESL classes.
4. CETA training requirements are partly met by traditional college vocational programs.
5. Non-traditional vocational programs are needed by CETA to stretch CETA dollars over more people and to compensate for fewer dollars in the Training for the Disadvantaged, Title II.
6. The Private Industry Councils (PICs) funding is being increased by 83 percent in FY 1982. PICs will have a larger role in defining the training necessary in their areas. Community college membership and participation in the PIC decision-making process is essential.

7. The training programs funded by PICs through CETA Prime Sponsors will be closely associated with the job vacancies that are listed with the Employment Security Departments. These are likely to be jobs that are only partially correlated with college vocational training programs.
8. Training programs funded by PICs are most likely to be contract instruction (non-FTE generating) and be heavily oriented toward the combined classroom instruction and OJT model.
9. Community colleges do not plan many open entry/open exit, self-paced vocational programs. Such programs are rare enough to be called non-traditional delivery systems even though the concept is quite old.
10. Some community-based instructional programs now in use by some colleges could easily be adapted to the combined classroom/OJT needs that will be emerging from the increased activity of the PICs.
11. Training for the Disadvantaged will remain a major social concern of the Reagan administration, but will be changed to involve the private sector employer more. Federal vocational funding will be increased in 1982-83. Planning for these changes in services to the disadvantaged should start in 1981-82.
12. The effectiveness of serving CETA-eligible students and CETA programs is directly related to the philosophy of top management of the college.
13. College vocational education advisory councils and CETA advisory councils are engaged in similar activities, often without contacting each other. CETA administrators and vocational directors both felt that some joint efforts would produce better results.
14. CETA services on campuses are better served when one college administrative person is given the responsibility for CETA coordination.
15. The shared funding rules established by SBCCE provide a very flexible model to provide services to CETA while controlling FTE generation.
16. The federal budget for FY 1982 increases CETA funding in the Job Corps and Private Sector Initiative program while reducing funding in training services and youth programs. Funding was eliminated for Public Service Employment and Conservation Corps. The implications are that the Labor Department is looking more toward non-traditional delivery systems for services to disadvantaged people, and putting money into those efforts.
17. CETA/college relations and communications have been the best in regions where the campus CETA administrator and the CETA regional officer administrator get together in fact-to-face meetings three or four times per year. In areas where the CETA regional office deals with more than one college, these meetings have been group sessions.

18. The funding levels of the colleges is such that increases in effort in one program is likely to be made only when corresponding decreases are made in another program. This kind of environment frequently leads to the development of priorities or policies concerning the distribution of funds at the campus level. Funding for programs for disadvantaged people becomes even more important during times of economic distress. Unless colleges place priorities on disadvantaged people, services to this deserving population are apt to decrease.
19. Enrollment ceilings imposed on the colleges from external sources are expected to cause changes in program offerings which are not yet clearly defined at the college level. It appeared that these changes were more apt to occur in summer session or continuing education programming. Across-the-board cuts will impact disadvantaged students at a higher percentage rate.
20. Increasing services to CETA-eligible people through PIC participation, contract classes, or other outside funded instructional service will increase the workload for the college administrative staff, especially the CETA coordinator.
21. Outside funding sources are likely to be more accessible to colleges for developing non-traditional training programs, especially in some kind of consortium concept. Leadership responsibility for developing these kinds of consortia has not been pinpointed in general. Some colleges are taking the initiative in their service area, while in other service areas colleges are waiting for others to assume leadership.
22. Incentives for colleges to develop services for the disadvantaged are basically professional pride and a small federal vocational sum earmarked for disadvantaged programs. Other incentives may be desirable to stimulate additional activity in providing increased service levels for training disadvantaged people for jobs.
23. There are sources of money to develop and operate short training programs which will lead to direct employment. These sources are: (a) Private Industry Councils in each CETA Prime Sponsor area and in each CETA (Balance of State) Planning area; (b) CETA special training programs, and (c) private industry contracts.
24. New federal tax laws have a provision which enables corporations to contribute up to ten percent of their taxable income to charitable functions. Few small corporations ever donate their maximum allowed deduction. Colleges are eligible to receive such funds which could be used to operate disadvantaged adult training programs.
25. Open entry/open exit, self-paced instruction is better suited to meet the needs of the majority of disadvantaged adults than is the traditional college vocational course of study.

26. Consortium arrangements among local service agencies, including PICs are frequently effective organizational structures for delivery of educational services and on-the-job training.
27. In those areas where the college was an active participant in area PICs and took a leadership role in developing programs for disadvantaged people, the entire spectrum of services to the disadvantaged was increased.
28. College and CETA cooperation produced good training programs. The private schools were more often willing to develop non-traditional type programs which featured open entry/open exit, self-paced instruction and on-the-job training. However, college vocational directors indicated there were no road blocks to prevent them from developing similar non-traditional programs. It was believed that if top management, or district board philosophy favored non-traditional planning, it could be done.
29. State Board staff is capable of providing technical assistance to districts in seeking outside funding and to organize consortiums in local areas to provide services for the disadvantaged.
30. During periods of economic distress, the disadvantaged adult has greater need of assistance than other times.
31. Federal policy is emerging which is targeting disadvantaged adults as trainable and employable. Vocational education funding is scheduled to be increased in FY 1983. These funds will not be included in block grants, but will continue to be earmarked. The new administration has made it clear that vocational training for the disadvantaged is a national priority. It could be a local priority as well.
32. Both CETA and vocational education are up for reauthorization in FY 1983. Assistant Secretary for Vocational Education, Dr. Robert Worthington, has identified the most successful programs funded by CETA as those where CETA prime sponsors have contracted with VTIs and colleges. Programs funded by local PICs are included.
33. Colleges can develop innovative programs to serve disadvantaged people which combine the resources of CETA, PICs, federal vocational funds and limited college resources. The shared funding concept encourages such approaches and provides an appropriate vehicle for management of FTE ceilings while maintaining a higher level of service within the community.
34. CETA administrators believe work attitude and assertiveness training and other attitude adjustment courses are best taught in combination with on-the-job training or in a "hands on" vocational lab.
35. There are many attitude training classes being operated by colleges, especially for displaced homemakers, that are equally applicable for other disadvantaged adults, but would be better utilized if they were combined with job training skills or on-the-job training.

36. Colleges can assume leadership in proposing (a) non-traditional training programs to CETA Prime Sponsors, (b) innovative combinations of knowledge training and on-the-job training, and (c) broader community involvement in training disadvantaged adults for employment. In communities where these things happen, it is observed that training program graduates' job placement rates are high, the ratio of successful completions of programs is high, and that percentage of minority participants is increasing. It is clear the leadership and involvement of the colleges was the key to the success of those disadvantaged adult programs.

IMPLEMENTATION

It is the districts that deliver educational services. Therefore, decisions about priorities, work assignments, and level of involvement in the community are decisions that are the sole prerogative of district boards and chief executive officers. There are some positive steps that could be taken at the district level that would maintain or increase the level of service to disadvantaged people.

A. Policy Options

1. Declare the commitment of the district to identify and serve the needs of the disadvantaged adults as a priority of the district.
2. Express the willingness of the district to participate in community activities which are intended to develop training and job placement opportunities for disadvantaged adults. This commitment includes assuming leadership roles in activities sponsored by the Comprehensive Training and Employment Act sponsors, Private Industry Councils (PICs) and other social service agencies.
3. Express approval for forming consortia groups, cooperative contractual arrangements, and seeking grants to develop and fund specialized educational and training experiences which culminate in job placement for disadvantaged adults.

B. Administrative Options

1. Assign administrative responsibility for development of programs for disadvantaged adults to a single qualified person on campus.
2. Assign a finite set of resources to be used for development of programs for disadvantaged adults.
3. Develop guidelines which provide a routine procedure for constructing contracts for special classes funded from outside sources. These guidelines should include means for calculating shared costs, contributions in kind, administrative overhead, and descriptions of services to be rendered.
4. Implement a "grants and contract" accounting system, if one does not exist, which will protect the district from the potentiality of any outside funds generated for operation of disadvantaged adult programs ever being considered as unanticipated revenue.
5. Continue ABE/GED classes, especially during evening hours, so that disadvantaged adults who are in on-the-job training programs can upgrade basic skills on the campus.

6. Assign the responsibility for participation in CETA planning councils and Private Industry Councils to a person on campus with the authority to act in the name of the college, and encourage the development of short open entry/open exit training programs which meet specialized employment needs within the district.

TABLE 11

1981 COMPARISONS CETA and VOCATIONAL ENROLLMENT IN
SAMPLE AREAS

Area	Agric.	Dist. Ed.	Health	H/F	Bus/Off	Tech.	T & I	TOTAL
CETA Av.	15	39	55	6	433	78	223	849
81 Projection	873	2,600	1,994	1,278	5,589	2,281	6,204	20,819
81 Voc. Dir.	1,068	2,366	2,197	1,173	5,508	1,944	5,413	19,669
1980 Enrollment	851	2,371	2,018	1,973	5,046	2,168	5,857	19,284
3 year Avg. Enrol.	817	1,904	2,060	1,157	4,795	1,928	4,890	17,551

TABLE 12

FY 82 CETA PROJECTIONS BY PROGRAM AREA

Unit	F.Q.	O.Q.	Total	Ag.	D.E.	Heal.	H/F	Bus.	Tech.	T&I
Statewide	1,185	932	2,117	42	85	127	20	1,080	191	572
Sample Area	734	578	1,312	26	52	79	13	670	118	354

TABLE 13

SCHOOL YEAR 81-82 PROJECTIONS

Voc. Enrol.	A.G.	D.E.	Health	H/F	Bus/Off	Tech	T&I	TOTAL
Statewide CC	1,595	3,600	4,148	1,908	8,157	3,878	8,643	31,989
CETA 81-82 Proj.	22	59	108	10	644	155	354	1,352
CETA 80-81	19	62	99	7	608	143	365	1,302
CETA Plans 81-82	24	48	71	11	604	107	320	1,185

TABLE 14

FY 82 CETA TITLE II B REFERRAL PLANS

PRIME SPONSOR	NO. REFERRALS
Seattle/King County	1,000
Pierce County	292
Tacoma	156
Kitsap County	425
Clark County	205
Yakima County	170
Spokane/Spokane County	351
Thurston County	67
Snohomish County	68
Balance of State	
TOTAL	3,993

TABLE 15
SAMPLE AREA
VOCATIONAL ENROLLMENT

PROGRAM	SEATTLE					SPOKANE					WALLA WALLA					WENATCHEE					TOTAL	
	78	79	80	81 Voc	81 Pro	78	79	80	81 Voc	81 Pro	78	79	80	81 Voc	81 Pro	78	79	80	81 Voc	81 Pro	81 Voc	81 Pro
Agric.	294	346	365	401	439	400	368	368	575	347	102	82	85	92	73	10	11	13	0	14	1,068	873
Dist. Ed.	1,227	1,154	1,868	1,871	2,057	316	329	296	305	309	25	36	40	40	49	122	131	167	150	185	2,366	2,600
Health	1,330	1,289	1,327	1,358	1,300	461	456	421	532	406	196	152	160	180	145	141	128	101	100	137	2,197	1,994
H/F	372	411	564	773	710	217	489	412	400	568	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	1,173	1,278
Bus/Off	2,051	1,942	3,249	3,632	3,612	1,578	1,839	1,822	1,725	1,757	75	78	106	90	117	41	58	69	60	101	3,508	5,589
Tech	1,490	1,426	1,735	1,531	1,802	270	292	351	353	385	36	42	53	28	66	34	37	29	30	29	1,944	2,281
T & I	3,074	3,361	3,565	3,253	3,821	1,782	1,827	1,828	1,825	1,858	236	219	334	245	361	60	93	130	90	164	5,413	6,204
TOTAL	9,827	9,919	12,690	12,820	13,647	5,024	5,697	5,298	5,744	5,614	670	609	787	675	745	419	458	509	430	552	19,669	20,819

81 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT

PROGRAM	Sample	State	% of State	Sample	% of Sample	Proj. State
Agriculture	1,068	1,595	67	15	1.4	22
Distributive Education	2,366	3,660	65	39	1.6	59
Health	2,197	4,148	53	55	2.5	108
Home/Family	1,173	1,908	61	6	0.5	10
Business/Office	3,508	8,157	68	433	7.9	644
Technical	1,944	3,878	50	78	4.0	135
T & I	5,413	8,613	63	223	4.1	351
TOTAL	19,669	31,989	62	849	4.3	1,352

TABLE 16
STATE CETA ENROLLMENTS BY AREA

78-79

78-79

PROGRAM	DISTRICT 17				WALLA WALLA		WENATCHEE		KING		TOTAL		TOTAL CETA	PERCENT OF TOTAL
	F.S.P.O.,W		SPOKANE		F.Q.	O.Q.	F.Q.	O.Q.	F.Q.	O.Q.	F.Q.	O.Q.		
	F.Q.	O.Q.	F.Q.	O.Q.										
Agriculture	1	0			1		2	1	7	4	10	6	16	2
Dist. Educ.	2	0						1	15	9	17	10	27	3
Health	2	1			13	6	15	3	18	5	48	14	62	7
Home/Family		1					1		8	1	9	2	11	1
Bus/Office	6	2	141	172	3	2	12	4	48	19	210	199	409	49
Technical					3				23	16	26	16	42	5
T & I	5	2	41	50	14	111	4	1	29	20	93	183	276	33
TOTAL	16	3	182	222	33	120	34	9	148	74	413	430	843	

79-80

Agriculture						5	3	1	12	0	15	16	21	2
Dist. Educ.	3	1				3	1	2	45	3	48	9	57	7
Health	4	1			14	4	12	7	16	2	46	13	59	7
Home/Family									6	0	6	0	6	1
Bus/Office	16		134	163	10	5	25	7	61	20	246	195	441	51
Technical					4	3			49	33	53	36	89	10
T & I	2	1	39	50	3	20	12	2	47	12	103	85	188	22
TOTAL	25	2	173	213	31	40	53	19	236	70	519	339	862	

80-81

Agriculture					3			1	5	0	8	1	9	1
Dist. Educ.					2				21	9	23	9	32	4
Health	3				8		15		9	6	38	6	44	5
Home/Family	1								1	0	2	0	2	0
Bus/Office	8		106	129	14	2	55	7	60	69	240	207	447	53
Technical					2				51	51	53	51	104	12
T & I	8	1	29	36	21	3	24	2	56	26	138	68	206	25
TOTAL	17	1	135	165	50	5	97	10	203	161	502	342	844	

TABLE 17
1981 ENROLLMENTS BY PROGRAM (PROJECTION)

College	Agriculture		Dist. Educ.		Health		Home/Family		Bus./Office		Technical		Trade & Ind.		TOTAL	
	Voc.Dir. 1980		Voc.Dir. 1980		Voc.Dir. 1980		Voc.Dir. 1980		Voc.Dir. 1980		Voc.Dir. 1980		Voc.Dir. 1980		Voc.Dir. 1980	
Bellevue	126	75	598	590	276	197	198	137	250	278	50	31	350	365	1,848	1,673
Big Bend	18	12	25	20	20	38	0	0	100	85	190	126	129	121	482	402
Centralia	20	15	25	13	26	31	0	0	90	83	120	115	40	38	321	295
Clark	65	33	25	41	172	129	42	47	213	260	128	80	350	350	995	940
Columbia Basin	33	33	48	48	97	97	14	14	131	131	212	212	252	252	787	787
Edmonds	45	70	150	216	60	59	25	24	290	290	90	84	80	62	740	825
Everett	0	0	60	56	214	190	0	48	350	373	140	133	600	590	1,394	1,390
Fort Steilacoom	75	77	150	150	140	144	95	95	350	364	10	14	150	151	970	995
Grays Harbor	36	34	36	50	42	52	80	0	222	131	30	46	185	120	631	433
Green River	35	36	198	230	126	129	0	0	202	281	98	274	248	544	905	1,494
Highline	0	0	623	600	230	181	150	146	750	704	130	115	245	230	2,130	1,976
Lower Columbia	0	0	80	79	100	99	50	42	180	177	85	80	270	261	765	738
Olympia Tech.	50	47	90	89	120	132	0	0	400	418	100	88	270	242	1,030	1,016
Peninsula	36	38	50	49	72	76	0	0	83	83	85	92	90	85	416	423
Seattle Central	0	23	90	70	224	288	210	110	1,286	503	240	235	955	884	3,005	2,113
Seattle North	0	0	10	5	190	202	160	107	435	445	425	432	195	214	1,415	1,405
Seattle South	240	251	20	18	0	0	0	0	490	523	320	352	960	1,007	2,030	2,151
Shoreline	0	0	330	355	312	330	55	61	220	237	270	296	300	321	1,487	1,600
Spokane Community	575	368	275	271	529	396	0	0	875	785	355	350	1,300	1,295	3,909	3,465
Spokane Falls	0	0	297	313	30	25	400	412	850	837	0	1	525	533	2,102	2,121
Tacoma	0	0	80	74	165	172	40	82	40	36	15	16	67	96	427	476
Walla Walla	92	85	40	40	180	169	0	0	90	106	28	53	245	334	675	757
Wenatchee	0	13	155	167	100	101	0	0	60	69	30	29	90	130	435	509
Whatcom	1	43	6	4	25	24	10	6	55	45	0	0	20	20	117	147
Yakima	30	32	50	55	350	367	27	31	55	49	26	34	150	161	688	729
Olympic	75	33	90	224	130	114	352	0	360	290	588	175	347	295	1,942	1,131
Skagit	43	39	62	56	218	198	0	0	121	110	115	107	210	191	769	701
TOTAL	1,595	1,362	3,665	3,883	4,148	3,940	1,908	1,362	8,578	7,693	3,878	3,570	8,643	8,912	32,415	30,722

MINUTES OF
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

"Development of Policy Options to Maximize Access
to Community Colleges by CETA-Eligible Individuals"

Highline Community College
Board Room

August 7, 1981
9:30 a.m.

The meeting was convened at 9:35 a.m. by Richard Moe, SBCCE, who introduced Hobart Jenkins, Project Director; Ed Smith, Project Assistant; Margaret Genster, Project Liaison and the steering committee members.

After review of the project agenda and calendar, Moe said that the results of the meeting were critical to this project, made possible by a CETA contract from the Employment and Training Division of Employment Security. The project was developed as a result of community college concerns with education and training for disadvantaged people in the present circumstances of budget cuts, tuition increases, and reduced CETA funding.

Jim Montzheimer asked what impact the steering committee will have on the colleges. Dick Moe responded that some of the problems might be addressable by policy at the state or district level.

Dr. Jenkins reviewed the findings of the study. The sample used in the study covered four areas of the state, included 11 community colleges that enrolled 62 percent of the vocational preparatory students. The study found that CETA referrals probably will be served, but that 2/3 of CETA-eligible people are not being served, one of several problem areas listed for committee consideration.

I. PROBLEM AND OPPORTUNITY AREAS

1. CETA/College Relations. (6. Campus/CETA Coordination.) CETA relationships with campuses seemed best when the college had a high priority on programs for the disadvantaged. Several committee members agreed that to be successful, top-level support from the board and president on down is needed. The use of a single CETA coordinator on campus, with freedom of flexibility, also seems to improve communications. The importance of CETA people understanding the community college system was also pointed out, as well as a need for coordination between CETA agencies to cut paperwork in overlapping areas.

Bruce Perry suggested consideration of regular meetings between CETA and community college people, perhaps quarterly, to communicate and share information.

2. CETA Training Formats. The lack of multiple entry points, sequence of courses, and length of programs were cited as problem areas. The referral agencies have clients weekly and the CETA philosophy is to train

people in as short a time as possible for early placement in available jobs. The community colleges emphasized training a student in a longer program and then looking for career placement.

Also, community colleges were not as successful in bidding for contract classes as other vocational schools. The causes seem to be associated with the longer length of the training programs in the colleges and the overhead costs.

3. Coupled Classroom Training. Referred to in the study as co-op training, CETA finds this method, whereby students attend classes part of the week and report to their on-the-job training the rest of the week, an effective way to get people into the job market quickly. With this training, employers are given tax incentives, as well as partial reimbursement for wages. The community colleges have very little coupled classroom training with OJT. Colleges place more emphasis on traditional vocational education and saw little incentive to develop coupled training programs.

Some committee members expressed the opinion that, in some cases, the tax incentive for employees was not being used properly, and that abuses were showing up. Some revisions in the tax incentive process are being developed now to curb the abuses.

4. ABE/GED/ESL. Most CETA-eligible people are educationally disadvantaged and need basic skills. If these programs were diminished or curtailed in the community colleges, the CETA trainees would be adversely affected.
5. The Untouched Disadvantaged. Only about 1/3 of CETA-eligible people are being served, leaving 2/3 untrained and chronically unemployed. Those people who do come to the community colleges are being served. The problem is how to reach the rest. It was suggested that Employment Security might have some suggestions for a solution and that this problem might be addressed through policy commitment.
6. (Incorporated into number 1.)
7. CETA RFPs for Special Classes. It was suggested that if the RFP procedure were shortened, colleges might be more competitive in getting these contracts and, also, that individual contracts might be negotiated. Another aid to developing the RFPs could be to work with community-based organizations. The RFPs are developed and funded by the consortiums, but the Prime Sponsor has responsibility for the success or failure of the programs. CETA people indicated that federal rules made the process what it is. Advisory groups from the college and CETA do similar work, but frequently are not working together.
8. Advisory Groups. Stan Gilles said that if CETA persons are on advisory committees, there are no problems. Some coordination of CETA advisory groups seemed desirable.

9. Shared Funding Potential. A recent change in state law will allow the use of shared funding to serve the disadvantaged and could help with the enrollment ceiling problem. Vocational directors need to be made aware of this, as it is not yet being used to any great extent.

Dick Moe will send information on shared funding to Margaret Genster to distribute to all Prime Sponsors.

10. Development of Alternative Delivery Funding Organization. Bob Stauffer suggested consideration of an alternative delivery system as he feels the programs cannot be handled by the present community college system. He said that possibly a consortium could go to foundations for funding, at least for start up money. He thinks it might be time to leave traditional thinking to face future problems and look for funding somewhere other than CETA.

Tony Ruiz agreed it might be time to leave traditionalism to train for the future. He again stressed the importance of open entry/exit programs.

Bruce Perry said that a national employment and training policy will come from the federal government sometime between October and December and shortly thereafter they will introduce what is proposed for the actual programs. He said the funding will be less and they will expect quantifiable output. Performance-based allocations may be implemented which could cause changes in the payment of allowances. Emphasis is on less classroom work with increased on-the-job training.

II. SUGGESTED POLICY OPTIONS

1. Status Quo.
2. State Board develop policies.
3. State Board recommend policies.
4. State Board develop financial and other incentives to district boards to act upon.
5. State Board develop proposals for outside funding for pilot projects, demonstration, model testing in a consortium concept.

Dick Moe said that the State Board has set a general policy concerning the disadvantaged. The charge of this steering committee is to recommend policy options and that the study be done to develop policy options to be presented to the State Board.

Options 1 and 2 were rejected through discussion. Option 5 was supported indirectly.

#1, Status Quo. Dick Moe pointed out that the legislature has not yet felt the need to address issues of the disadvantaged, but could. Earl Weber said that he feels the legislature did address it by limiting funding and enrollments. Moe responded that they said serve fewer people, not cut aid to disadvantaged.

#2, State Board Develop Policies. Several committee members were against this option, feeling that problems can be better handled at the local level. It was felt that local boards will need leeway in setting policy. One problem is where to place trained people in depressed times. Local boards need the ability to make changes quickly and not be impeded by State Board policy.

Committee members outside of the community college system were asked if a State Board policy would be helpful. Margaret Genster said she feels the community colleges have an obligation to serve CETA people and need to be more flexible. She feels the State Board could make a policy statement to encourage campuses to be more flexible, use shared funding, etc. Mel McCoy would like to be able to point to a solid and detailed policy in his plan presentation to the Department of Labor.

The opinion was that State Board policy leads to inflexibility rather than flexibility and that problems are better handled by local dialogue.

Option #5, SBCCE Develop Proposals. . . This option was felt to have too many implications. Carl Devin stated that he felt, in relationship to options #2, 3, and 4, that if as much emphasis was put on these as on course coding, there would be no problems.

The question was asked, in responding to CETA requests, if the private sector could be reached without each campus making contacts? In reply, it was stated that the State Board does not have the responsibility for providing education; the districts do, but direction and guidance from the Board would be helpful in getting funding. Walt Roberts feels strongly that since business gets tax write offs, they have an obligation to the disadvantaged. Since public dollars are now available for investment, he feels there is no better investment than education and that the State Board should work with industry to develop a conscience and cooperation in funding opportunities for training.

Bruce Perry asked if perhaps the State Board could come up with a broad policy statement that would allow districts to deal with the issues.

Option #3, the State Board can recommend policies, and Option #4, the State Board can develop financial and other incentives to district boards to act upon, were accepted. The areas of concern to be served by these options are:

1. Service to CETA eligible not now being served
2. Flexibility for district boards to act in non-traditional fashion
3. Development of a conscience in industry to serve as a source of training funds

4. Encourage district local CETA organizations to pursue resolution of communication problems

This study will be presented next to the Washington Association of Community College Presidents (WACCP), the Vocational Directors Council, SBCCE staff, and, in September, to the State Board.

Materials will be sent to all committee members.

The meeting adjourned 12:40 p.m.

Steering Committee Members:

Margaret Genster	Employment Security	Project Coordination
Larry Malo	Employment Security	Balance of State
Bruce Perry	King-Seattle Consortium	CETA Prime Sponsor
Jack Moffitt	Operation Improvement	CETA Referral Agency
Stan Gilles	Grays Harbor CC Trustee	Trustees' Association of Community Colleges
Robert Stauffer	Ft. Steilacoom CC	Washington Association of Community Colleges
Tony Ruiz	South Seattle CC	Minority Affairs Directors
Vince Ortiz	Commission for Vocational Education	CVE - CETA
Robert Beardemphl	South Seattle CC	Instruction Commission
Earl Weber	North Seattle CC	Instruction Commission
Carl Devin	Lower Columbia College	Vocational Directors' Council
James Montzheimer	Shoreline Community College	Vocational Directors' Council
Keith Kirkbride	Spokane Falls CC	Vocational Directors' Council
Walter Roberts	Skagit Valley College	Vocational Directors' Council
Mel McCoy	Spokane City-County Employment and Training Division	CETA Prime Sponsor



State of Washington
STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION
Resolution No. 81-68

A resolution relating to commitment to maintain programs and services to disadvantaged students.

WHEREAS the Community College Act of 1967 states that community colleges will "offer an open door to every citizen, regardless of his academic background or experience," and

WHEREAS the Community College Act of 1967 states further that "no student will be denied admission because of his educational background or ability and that curriculum offerings will be provided to meet the educational and training needs of the students," and

WHEREAS the community colleges provide access for many students, who for reasons of low income, academic deficiencies, or interest in vocational education, would not otherwise avail themselves of higher education, and

WHEREAS the number of disadvantaged persons served by training programs in the state of Washington is less than one third of the disadvantaged persons in the state, and

WHEREAS the need for skill and knowledge training to enter the labor market is essential in the 1980s, and

WHEREAS the community college system will be shifting from an open door posture to an era of enrollment management, the system must develop new programs to serve the disadvantaged adult, and

WHEREAS some of the vocational programs in the system do not lend themselves to open entry/open exit self-paced programs, some method must be found to implement these types of programs for the disadvantaged adult, and

WHEREAS the shared funding rules established by SBCCE provide the colleges with a vehicle to limit their FTE generation without reducing their services and provide avenues for operating new programs for the disadvantaged adult, and

WHEREAS outside funding sources through the Comprehensive Education and Training Act and private employment tax incentives are likely to be more accessible to colleges for developing non-traditional programs, and

WHEREAS Adult Basic Education, General Education Development, and English as a Second Language programs provided by the districts have been powerful tools to serve the needs of disadvantaged adults, and

WHEREAS district administrators have taken leadership roles by working with CETA officials and participating in the Private Industry Councils in their communities which have increased the opportunities for disadvantaged adults, and

WHEREAS financial limitations and enrollment ceilings will create hardships for districts to meet the ever increasing needs of the disadvantaged adult population,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the State Board for Community College Education reaffirms its commitment to provide means of access to vocational education for those who would otherwise be denied the opportunity by:

(a) Commending the districts for their services to the disadvantaged through their own programs, cooperation with CETA, and participation in the community Private Industry Councils, and

(b) Recognizing the contributions made by the colleges in providing leadership for the development of opportunities designed to serve the unique needs of the disadvantaged.

AND FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that the State Board for Community College Education accept the report "Development of Policy Options to Maximize Access to Community Colleges by CETA-Eligible Individuals" and commend it to the districts for their study and any potential implementation of the recommendations contained within.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED September 11, 1981.

Walter S. Johnson, Chairman

ATTEST:

John N. Terrey, Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 36

43

DEC 10 1982